

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
AT KNOXVILLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No.: 3:20-CR-100-KAC-JEM-2
	)	
CODY ANDREW SEALS,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	


**ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

This criminal case is before the Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation (“Report”) issued by Magistrate Judge Jill E. McCook [Doc. 159], regarding Defendant Cody Andrew Seals’s “Motion to Suppress Statements of Defendant” [Doc. 139]. As set forth in the Report, Defendant moves to suppress certain statements he made during a recorded police interrogation on or about January 16, 2020 [See Doc. 159 at 2]. The Government states that it “does not intend to, and . . . will not, introduce any portion of” the “statement by defendant made on January 16, 2020 shortly after he was released from the hospital and in which he demonstrates difficulty remembering things” during its “case-in-chief” [Doc. 143 at 1]. The “Government asserts that the legal issue in question is moot,” and “Defendant Seals agrees” [Doc. 159 at 1 (citing Docs. 143, 151)]. Judge McCook, therefore, issued her Report, recommending “that the Motion to Suppress Statements of Defendant be **DENIED as moot**” [*Id.* at 4-5 (emphasis in original) (citations omitted)]. No objections were filed and the time to object has passed. Fed. R. Crim. P. 59(b)(2) (“Within 14 days after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, . . . a

party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations.”).

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), “[a] judge of the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). And the Court need not engage in de novo review of undisputed portions of the Report. *See Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Here, no Party filed any objections to the Report’s findings or recommendations [See Doc. 159]. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report’s findings [*Id.*]. Upon review of the Report, and in consideration of the relevant law, the Court also **ACCEPTS** Judge McCook’s recommendation [*Id.*] and **DENIES as moot** the “Motion to Suppress Statements of Defendant” [Doc. 139].

IT IS SO ORDERED.

  
KATHERINE A. CRYTZER  
United States District Judge